



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/609,387	07/03/2000	T. Frank Wang	8229-006-27	3989
23552	7590	01/11/2006	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			DEO, DUY VU NGUYEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1765	
DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/609,387	Applicant(s) WANG, T. FRANK	
	Examiner DuyVu n. Deo	Art Unit 1765	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-32 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (US 5,545,289), Shoji (US 5,853,602) and Olson et al. (US 5,705,433).

Chen discloses an etching method for unetched refractory metal-containing layer to an end point using a first and second comprises of chlorine source (col. 19, line 56-col. 20, line 17). Unlike claimed invention, Chen doesn't describe the first etchant comprises of a fluorine source. Shoji discloses a method for etching refractory metal wherein the etchant comprises of chlorine and fluorine source (col. 2, line 9-24). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Chen's etchant in light of Shoji by adding fluorine because Shoji teaches that this etchant that comprises of chlorine and fluorine sources provides an improved etching rate and selectivity between the refractory metal and oxide layer (ab.).

Unlike claimed invention, Chen and Shoji are silent about the bias power is 100-750 W and the source power is 100-450 W. Olson teaches etching refractory metal layer having the bias power of 200 w and source power of 300-3000W (col. 3, line 1-3, line 60-65). These ranges show that the bias and power are result-effective variables. Therefore, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would find it obvious, in light of Olson's teaching, to determine the

Art Unit: 1765

optimum bias and source power through routine experimentation for etching of the refractory metal layer with a reasonable expectation of success.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see amendment filed 10/19/05, with respect to claims 13-35, under Mu, Olson, Roberts have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 13-35 has been withdrawn.

4. Applicant's arguments, see amendment, filed 10/19/05, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 33-35 under Mu and Olson have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Chen, Shoji, and Olson.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 13-32 are allowed.

6. claims 13, 14, 31, 32 are allowed because applied prior art doesn't suggest or teach: etching the unetched refractory metal-containing material layer of the semiconductor device with a first etchant chemistry which comprises a chlorine source free of BC13 and a fluorine source, followed with etching the semiconductor device with a second etchant chemistry which is free of fluorine.

7. claims 15-30 are allowed because applied prior art doesn't suggest or teach: etching the unetched refractory metal-containing layer to an end point using a first etchant chemistry at a source power of from about 100 watts to about 450 watts and a bias power of from about 200 watts to about 500 watts, wherein the first etchant chemistry comprises a chlorine source free of BC13 and a fluorine source; and etching partially through the oxide layer using a second etchant

Art Unit: 1765

chemistry, wherein the second etchant chemistry comprises a chlorine source, and contains no fluorine.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DuyVu n. Deo whose telephone number is 571-272-1462. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-2:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1765

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner

Duy-Vu N. Deo

1/9/06

